

Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application, as amended herein, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3 and 5 - 14 are presently pending in the application. Claims 1, 5 and 14 have been amended. Claim 2 has been canceled herein. Claim 4 was previously canceled.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that claims 2, 5 - 8, 12 and 13 have been indicated as being allowable if rewritten to include all the limitations of the claims from which those claims depend. Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of former claim 2, indicated as being allowable in item 7 of the Office Action. Additionally, per item 7 of the Office Action, Applicant has amended claim 5, indicated as being allowable, to include the limitations of former claim 1, from which claim 5 depended. As such, per item 7 of the Office Action, it is believed that independent claim 1 and 5, and claims 3, 6 - 8, 12 and 13, depending therefrom, are in condition for immediate allowance.

Claim 14 has additionally been amended herein, to include the limitation introduced in former claim 2. Such limitation was not indicated in the Office Action as being found in the prior art. As such, it is believed that amended claim 14 is also patentable over the prior art cited in the Office Action.

Applic. No. 09/897,279

Response Dated March 10, 2006

Responsive to Office Action of November 10, 2005

In item 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1 and 9 - 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 5,206,881 to Messenger et al ("**MESSENGER**"). In item 6 of the Office Action, claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 5,576,702 to Samoylenko ("**SAMOYLENKO**").

In item 5 of the Office Action, claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over **MESSENGER** in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,463,646 to Dillon et al ("**DILLON**").

The above rejections are believed to be moot in view of the amendments made to claims 1 and 14.

It is accordingly believed that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 5 and 14. Claims 1, 5 and 14 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 1 or 5.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 3 and 5 - 14 are solicited.

Applic. No. 09/897,279
Response Dated March 10, 2006
Responsive to Office Action of November 10, 2005

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Additionally, please consider the present as a petition for a one (1) month extension of time, and please provide a one (1) month extension of time, to and including, March 10, 2006 to respond to the present Office Action.

The extension fee for response within a period of one (1) month pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$120.00 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please provide any additional extensions of time that may be necessary and charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer, L.L.P., No. 12-1099.

Applic. No. 09/897,279

Response Dated March 10, 2006

Responsive to Office Action of November 10, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant

Kerry P. Sisselman

Reg. No. 37,237

March 10, 2006

Lerner Greenberg Steiner LLP

Post Office Box 2480

Hollywood, FL 33022-2480

Tel: (954) 925-1100

Fax: (954) 925-1101